



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,085	12/21/2001	Stephen M. Watts	TI-29923	8279

23494 7590 07/10/2003

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

PATEL, PARESH H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2829

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,085

Applicant(s)

WATTS, STEPHEN M.

Examiner

Paresh Patel

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maeng (US 6313652).

Regarding claims 1, 12 and 19 Maeng in fig. 4-5 discloses: An apparatus [100 or 200] for testing at least one first integrated circuit (IC) [one IC of one of trays 10] and at least one second IC [one IC of another tray 10], comprising:

a first tester [100a or one head of 23 with 32] adapted to test the at least one first IC [one IC of one of trays 10] with a first test procedure [either burin-in or test, see lines 58-62 of column 8];

a second tester [100b or another head of 23 with 32] adapted to test the at least one first IC [one IC of one tray 10] with a second test procedure [either burin-in or test, see lines 58-62 of column 8] simultaneously [lines 22-30 of column 8] while the first tester tests the at least one second IC with the first test procedure; and

a single handler [45 via 21a and 21b or 21] coupled to the first and second testers;

wherein the first and second test procedures are adapted to test at least some different IC parameters [lines 58-62 of column 8].

Regarding claim 2, Maeng discloses: a portion of the second test procedure [inherent to DC test and burn in test] comprises the same IC tests as at least a portion of the first test procedure [inherent to DC test and burn-in test].

Regarding claim 3, Maeng discloses:

a first test head [one head of 100 or 100a] coupled to the first tester;

a first load board [32] coupled to the first test head and the handler;

a second test head [another head of 100 or 100a] coupled to the second tester;

and

a second load board [32] coupled to the second test head and the handler.

Regarding claim 4, Maeng discloses:

a first device [38 or 40] adapted to move the first IC's to the first load board; and

a second device [38 or 40] adapted to move the second IC's to the first load board simultaneously while the first device moves the first IC's to the second load board.

Regarding claims 5 and 13, Maeng discloses: the first tester is a low cost tester [one of 100 in 200] and the second tester [another one of 100 in 200] is a high cost tester, wherein the first test procedure is completed by the completion of the second test procedure [inherent to 10 with 23 because all trays 10 move simultaneously after different test].

Regarding claims 6 and 14, Maeng discloses: the apparatus [200] is adapted to move the at least one first IC to the second tester [moving IC between 23 or 100's of 200]. simultaneously while the apparatus moves the at least one second IC to the first tester.

Regarding claim 7, Maeng discloses: the apparatus is adapted to move the at least one second IC to the second tester, simultaneously while moving at least one third IC to the first tester [moving IC between 23 or 100's of 200]..

Regarding claims 8, 15 and 20, Maeng discloses: the first test procedure comprises prescreening tests [DC test], wherein the second test procedure comprises detailed functional tests [hot-sort test].

Regarding claims 9 and 16, Maeng discloses: at least one third tester [third of 23 in 100 or third of 100 in 200] coupled to the handler adapted to test the first IC's with a third test procedure while simultaneously testing the second IC's.

Regarding claims 10 and 17, Maeng discloses: first IC's that fail the first test procedures [a procedure before IC's are sorted with 51] are not moved to the second tester for testing with the second test procedure.

Regarding claims 11 and 18, Maeng discloses: the first and second IC's are packaged [lines 38-42 of column 1].

Art Unit: 2829

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paresh Patel whose telephone number is 703-306-5859. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30 to 4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kammie Cuneo can be reached on 703-308-1233. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Paresh Patel
June 29, 2003



EVAN PERT